

XIII—*On some New Guinea Bird-names.*

By GREGORY M. MATHEWS, M.B.O.U.

AN account of the Birds collected by the British Ornithologists' Union Expedition to New Guinea, written by Mr. Ogilvie-Grant, has recently been published in the Jubilee Supplement No. 2 of this Journal. As a whole, this is a good and full account, and will be extremely useful to later workers when dealing with New Guinea birds. Many of the genera and species there dealt with occur in Australia, and Mr. Ogilvie-Grant has often noted my conclusions regarding Australian forms, generally to disagree with them. I do not propose to trouble the readers of 'The Ibis' with controversial opinions, but I feel it necessary to record how frequently Mr. Ogilvie-Grant has ignored my published notes dealing with facts. It is obvious that Mr. Ogilvie-Grant's paper will be often utilized as a basis for future work, so it is important to point out what rectifications are required at the earliest opportunity. The succeeding notes only deal with such points as have occurred to me while studying my own Australian Avifauna. It is possible that other nomenclatural errors may be found, but I have only concerned myself with those that I myself have come across.

I will take the species in the order given in the paper.

Page 2.

Gymnocorax senex.

Although Mr. Ogilvie-Grant has generally followed Messrs. Rothschild and Hartert, accepting all their mistakes, in this case they wrote (Nov. Zool. vol. xx. 1913, p. 520) *Gymnocorvus senex*.

This paper was issued on October 21, while on October 23, the 'Austral Avian Record,' vol. ii. nos. 2 & 3, appeared. Pages 49-54 contained a paper by myself, entitled "Dates of Publication of the Plates of the 'Ornithology . . . of the *Coquille*.'" The information in this paper has not been

made use of by Mr. Ogilvie-Grant, as will hereafter be noted. With regard to the present species, I quote my own words (p. 54):—" . . . In the Bull. Sci. Nat. Férussac, vol. x. 1827, p. 291. Lesson and Garnot described *Corvus tristis* (Atlas Zool. pl. 24)." The plate appeared with the name *Corvus senex*, and this name is used in the text of the 'Coquille.' In the Cat. Birds Brit. Mus. this species appears as a monotypic generic form, under the name *Gymnocorax senex*. I do not see that *Corvus tristis* is pre-occupied, so that the name of the species should be *tristis*. It is also necessary to revert to the genus *Gymnocorvus*, as *Gymnocorax* is simply a classical emendation. The species should therefore be known as

GYMNOCORVUS TRISTIS.

As a matter for inquiry, if emendations were admissible, which they are not, would it not be the secondary item of the compound that should be altered, not the primary constituent?

Page 4. *Phonygammus keraudreni*.

This name is correct, so far as I know, but the second reference needs rectification. It is given "*Phonygama keraudrenii*, Less. & Garn. Voy. 'Coquille,' Ois. i. p. 636, pl. xiii. (1826)."

In the paper I have just quoted I showed that the plate entitled "*Barita keraudrenii*" appeared in the first livraison, which was published in 1826; p. 636, however, did not appear until January 9, 1830. I am purposely confining these remarks to their most scant degree, and omitting all the surrounding items, which I have generally already published in detail elsewhere. By this means I hope to emphasize the essential fact with the wish that it will not be again overlooked.

Page 45. *Oriolus striatus*.

It appears this bird wants a new name. Mr. Ogilvie-Grant gives no primary reference, referring to the Cat. Birds, iii.,

published forty years ago, and then to Rothschild & Hartert, N. Z. x. p. 111 (1903), xx. p. 526 (1913). At the latter reference Rothschild & Hartert cite the species thus:—

“*Oriolus striatus* Quoy et Gaimard, Voy. ‘Astrolabe,’ i. 1830, p. 195, pl. ix. fig. 2 : Dorey, New Guinea.”

This species was placed in *Mimeta* by Salvadori. *Mimeta* was founded on Latham’s *Coracias sagittata*, as a synonym of which stands *Coracias striata* Shaw. This name invalidates that given by Quoy and Gaimard, and for their *Oriolus striatus* I propose

MIMETA GRANTI, nom. nov.

Page 63.

Ptilotis.

This generic name is used for a long series of species, which are certainly heterogeneous. Moreover, the name is very doubtfully applicable to any one of them. In the ‘Austral Avian Record,’ vol. i. p. 184, published March 20, 1913, I gave a note on “The Genus-name *Meliphaga*,” and there I showed that the type of *Meliphaga* Lewin was identical with the type of *Ptilotis* Swainson and antedated it. In my ‘List of the Birds of Australia’ I utilized (p. 273) *Meliphaga* to replace *Ptilotis*. No contravention (that I know of) of my facts has appeared.

Later, in the same Journal, vol. ii. p. 111, September 24, 1914, I proposed *Dorothina* as a new name for *Meliphaga* Lewin, on account of the prior *Melophagus* Latreille in Sonnini’s Buffon Ins. vol. iii. p. 466 (1802).

It would have been interesting to read Mr. Ogilvie-Grant’s comments on my notes, as in the B. O. U. ‘List of British Birds’ such items were variously dealt with, and no consistent procedure was attempted. Consequently, I cannot guess whether my conclusions, had they been noticed, would have been accepted or rejected.

Page 72.

Ptilotis chrysotis saturatior.

The specific name cannot be maintained, as the type of “*Ptilotis*” was called *Meliphaga chrysotis* by Lewin. As a

matter of fact, Lesson himself, the author of the second "*chrysolis*," corrected his error, naming the bird *Myzantha flaviventer* in the 'Manuel d'Ornith.' vol. ii. 1828, p. 67. Moreover, the name appeared simultaneously with the invalid name on the plate only, while the text covering the species in the Voy. 'Coquille' was not published until two years later.

The most applicable name is that utilized by me in my 'List of the Birds of Australia,' 1913, p. 282, viz. :—

XANTHOTIS FLAVIVENTER.

The subspecific name, *saturationior*, is probably correct.

Page 139. **Monarcha chalybeocephalus.**

Mr. Ogilvie-Grant has given a note concerning this name :—“This species was first described from New Ireland under the above name [Garnot, Voy. 'Coquille,' i. p. 589, pl. xv. fig. 1 (1826)], and subsequently as *Drymophila alecto* from Celebes [Temminck, Pl. Col. pl. 430. fig. 1 (1827)].” Had the article on the Voy. 'Coquille' been consulted, this erroneous statement would not have been promulgated.

In that paper I showed that plate xv. did not appear until late in 1828, while p. 589 of the text was not issued until late in 1829. As Temminck's name was published in 1827, it has clear priority and the name to be used should be

PIEZORHYNCHUS ALECTO,

as given in my 'List of Birds of Australia,' 1913, p. 190.

Though the generic name *Monarcha* is considered the most suitable by Mr. Ogilvie-Grant, Australian field-ornithologists, from study of the birds themselves, have preferred the one I give.

Page 145. **Myiagra latirostris mimikæ.**

In the 'Austral Avian Record,' vol. ii. pp. 95-96, September 24, 1914, I detailed the history of Gould's *M. latirostris*, and may briefly note the facts.

Vieillot described a *Platyrynchos ruficollis*, and this has been recognized by Berlepsch and Hellmayr. Swainson described Vieillot's type as *Myiagra latirostris* in 1838, and two years later Gould described the Australian bird under the same name. This latter usage is the one continued by Ogilvie-Grant, but it is obviously untenable.

The name to be used for the New Guinea bird, then, is

MYIAGRA RUFICOLLIS MIMIKÆ.

Page 177.

Pitta atricapilla.

Ogilvie-Grant observed: "There can be no doubt that *Pitta atricapilla* Quoy & Gaimard is the oldest name for this bird."

The specific name had, however, been previously used for a member of the same genus, and consequently Quoy and Gaimard's usage is invalid, and therefore reversion must be made to

PITTA NOVÆGUINÆ.

Page 224.

Lorius.

Since Mr. Ogilvie-Grant's paper was prepared, an inquiry into the names proposed in Boddaert's 'Table des Planches Enlum.,' by Iredale and myself, has been published in the 'Austral Avian Record,' vol. iii. pp. 31-51, Nov. 19, 1915. I do not regard this name as a mistake by Mr. Ogilvie-Grant, but I am drawing attention to the facts here as so many of my nomenclatural notes have been overlooked by him.

We there recorded that *Lorius* (mis-spelt *Larius*) was introduced by Boddaert in connection with *Psittacus ceclanensis*, p. 42, and, as this name is a synonym of *Psittacus roratus* Müller, 1776, given to the same plate, *Lorius* is equal to *Eclectus*.

For the genus Ogilvie-Grant is dealing with, Wagler's well-known

DOMICELLA

is available.

Page 237.

Cyclopsittacus.

It seems strange that in this case Ogilvie-Grant has disagreed with Rothschild and Hartert, as in the *Nov. Zool.* vol. xx. 1913, p. 485, they correctly used

OPOPSITTA.

This was due to my initiative, as I examined the basis of *Cyclopsitta* Reichenbach and recorded the result in the *Nov. Zool.* vol. xviii. 1912, p. 261. The writers quoted examined my data and found them to be correct. It may be objected that I write strongly, but this is necessary in view of the very important position held by Mr. Ogilvie-Grant: his actions, right or wrong, are liable to prejudice workers, unable to consider technical matters for themselves, and, consequently, he should be specially careful.

Page 240.

Solenoglossus.

Though Ogilvie-Grant has used this name to replace *Microglossus* auct., as determined by myself some years ago (*Nov. Zool.* vol. xviii. 1911, p. 11), a reconsideration is necessary, and I will fully discuss the matter in my 'Birds of Australia,' the part dealing with these birds being now in preparation. Again, though the date of publication of Vicillot's *Microglossus* is given "(*vide* C. D. Sherborn)," this had been published by me in the 'Austral Avian Record,' vol. ii. 1915, pp. 153-158.

Further, on p. 241, Ogilvie-Grant has written "*Solenoglossus aterrimus* (Gmel.) [Type-locality, New Holland = Cape York]," adding "Mr. Mathews . . . renamed the Queensland bird *Solenoglossus aterrimus macgillivrayi*, but, as shown, this is a pure synonym of *S. aterrimus* (Gmel.)."

If Mr. Ogilvie-Grant had been a diligent reader of 'The Ibis,' as well as a compendious contributor, he would not have erred in this matter, as in that Journal for January 1915 (p. 79) I gave the true facts of the "New Holland" citation by Gmelin. I am only dealing with facts in this place, and will fully debate all the points raised by

Mr. Ogilvie-Grant, and also Rothschild and Hartert, whose conclusions have been accepted, in my 'Birds of Australia.'

At the present time, the undoubted fact is that my name must be used for the Australian form, and consequently Ogilvie-Grant's nomenclature, so far as that is concerned, is wrong. If Rothschild and Hartert be right, which I doubt, then the name of the bird Ogilvie-Grant is dealing with is

SOLENOGLOSSUS ATERRIMUS ATERRIMUS.

Page 242.

Cacatua.

Ogilvie-Grant has continued the usage of this name for the genus I call *Cacatoes*. I here give the synonymy of the generic names, which shows what a poor claim Ogilvie-Grant's selection has. I will fully discuss the matter in my 'Birds of Australia,' as the matter is very complex and cannot be stated shortly here.

? *Kakadoe* Cuvier, 1798-1800.

Cacatoes Duméril, 1806.

Catacus Rafinesque, 1815.

Phytolophus Vieillot, 1816.

Cacatua Vieillot, 1817.

It is certain that whatever the ultimate designation of this many-named genus may be, it will not be the last-named. At present, and probably correctly, I use

CACATOES.

Page 245.

Dasyptilus pesqueti.

This name has apparently been accepted because Rothschild and Hartert used it in the *Nov. Zool.* vol. xx. 1913, p. 486. In the same journal, two years previously, I had written (vol. xviii. 1911, p. 13):—

“It is of interest to point out that *Dasyptilus* of Wagler (*loc. cit.* p. 502) is retained in the *Cat. Birds*, xx. p. 385, in preference to *Psittrichas* Lesson, while, when Wagler introduced his genus, he pointed out that he had been anticipated in publication by Lesson with *Psittrichas*, and it is this note that gives us some idea of the date of publication of

Wagler's paper." As a synonym of *Psittacus pecquetii* Less. (Bull. des Sci. Nat. xxv. p. 241, Juin 1831), Salvadori quotes *Banksianus fulgidus* Lesson, *Traité d'Orn.* p. 181, 1831 (type examined). I have shown that this part of the 'Traité d'Orn.' was published in 1830; hence a double change is necessary, and the bird called *Dasyptilus pecquetii* Lesson must bear the name

PSITTRICHAS FULGIDUS LESSON.

I overlooked the fact that Oberholser had previously noted the anterior publication of *Psittrichas*, but he did not observe the complex of the specific name.

However, it will be seen that recent writers on New Guinea birds have overlooked both Oberholser and myself.

Page 246.

Eclectus.

As indicated (*ante*, p. 299) under the name *Lorius*, this name will displace *Eclectus*. I have also stated this does not affect me greatly, as there is a prior *Eclectis*, which seems in this case to endanger the name at present used. Therefore it can easily be remedied by the usage of

LORIUS.

Page 249.

Ptistes.

As long ago as 1911 I discussed the status of the generic names *Aprosmictus* and *Ptistes* in the *Nov. Zool.* vol. xviii. p. 13. Apparently because Rothschild and Hartert overlooked my review and incorrectly used *Aprosmictus* in the *Nov. Zool.* vol. xx. 1913, p. 487, Ogilvie-Grant has followed suit.

Briefly the matter can be restated thus: Gould proposed *Aprosmictus* for two "types" in 1842. Gray, in 1855, fixed one of these absolutely as type. Against this action there is no appeal. In 1865, Gould himself split up the two species into two genera, and confusedly brought in the new name *Ptistes* for the species Gray had determined as type of *Aprosmictus*. This was a bad mistake, but it was accepted in the *Cat. Birds*, though it was known to be wrong, and now Ogilvie-Grant has continued the misusage.

Therefore, the species called *Ptistes erythropterus coccineopterus*, following van Oort, must be called

APROSMICTUS ERYTHROPTERUS COCCINEOPTERUS,

though I much doubt the subspecific name. The other bird, which is called *Aprosmictus callopterus wilhelminæ* by Ogilvie-Grant, and also by Rothschild and Hartert, should bear the name

ALISTERUS CALLOPTERUS WILHELMINÆ,

if it be accepted that the species is congeneric with *A. cyanopygius* (Vieillot).

On p. 251 the name would be

ALISTERUS DORSALIS,

under the same conditions.

Page 267. *Haliastur indus girrenera*.

As long ago as 1911 I indicated the misuse of the subspecific name "*girrenera*," writing (Nov. Zool. vol. xviii. p. 10) "Vieillot (Galerie d'Ois. i. pl. x. 1820) proposed *Haliaëtus girrenera* simply as a new name for the bird described as *Falco pondicerianus* Gmelin, and therefore advocated Gould's name."

Rothschild and Hartert have disputed this conclusion, but it seems their reasons were not duly considered, as the facts are very clear. However, Ogilvie-Grant does not quote these writers as his authority for his use of the name, and, as he does not generally quote primary references, I do not know whether he has referred to Vieillot's work. The correct name is

HALIASTUR INDUS LEUCOSTERNUS.

Page 268. *Baza subcristata*.

The remarks regarding the forms of this species may be correct, and show that a careful criticism of the birds was made. Had the same care been bestowed upon the generic name a change would have been made. In my 'Birds of

Australia' now printed, I have given the results of an investigation into this matter, and would note that true *Baza* seems easily generically separable from this species. If, however, the complex genus usually accepted under this name be continued, then *Baza* cannot be maintained, as it is of later date than *Aviceda*, one of the names usually ranked as a synonym. This was given to an African group which, moreover, resembles the above species more than typical *Baza*. For the present species I use

LOPHASTUR.

Page 275.

Ibis molucca.

I have shown that the correct generic name is *Threskiornis*, the details being published in the 'Auk,' vol. xxx. 1913, pp. 92-95. Mr. Ogilvie-Grant cannot claim to have been unaware of this, as on p. 276 he refers to the place (Birds Austr. iii. 1914, p. 378) where I used *Threskiornis* for the present species. I also gave anew a sketch of the 'Auk' paper, but, as Mr. Ogilvie-Grant even misquotes my remarks, it is probable that he did not read the previous notes.

Page 276.

Notophoxyx picata.

Ogilvie-Grant has written "*N. aruensis* Gray is said to be the immature of *N. picata*, but this has been denied by Sharpe."

In the 'Birds of Australia,' vol. iii. 1914, p. 447, I wrote: "The immature spoken of by Gould as belonging to this species is undoubtedly so." This result was arrived at by the acquisition of Australian specimens showing the plumage-changes.

In any case, the name used by Ogilvie-Grant is wrong, as Gould's name was preoccupied, as pointed out by Sharpe in the Cat. Birds Brit. Mus. vol. xxvi. p. 654, 1898, where he renamed Gould's bird *Notophoxyx flavirostris*. The New Guinea bird would be the same as the Aru Island form, so that the name to be used should be

NOTOPHOXYX ARUENSIS.

Page 280.

Hydralector.

Ogilvie-Grant discusses the forms of the species formerly known as *H. gallinaceus*, and his conclusions regarding subspecies may be questioned. His usage of *Hydralector* is, however, unquestionably wrong. He has quoted my Birds Austr. iii. p. 316, under a name *I did not use*. On p. 314 I restated the case for *Irediparra*, a name which I proposed for this species in the Nov. Zool. vol. xviii. 1911, p. 7. My arguments have been criticised by careful workers, such as Hellmayr, and have been accepted. The correct name is

IREDIPARRA.

Page 301.

Carpophaga.

Years ago Richmond pointed out that this name was absolutely preoccupied by Billberg. As a matter of fact, under British usage, it had been continually invalid, as there was a prior *Carpophagus* on record all the time. However, Rothschild and Hartert, the most important workers and writers on New Guinea Birds, simply overlooked this correction and continued the misusage. This was not done intentionally, but was a pure oversight. As the result, the name has been persisted in by Hellmayr, Stresemann, Stuart Baker, and now Ogilvie-Grant. I have already indicated this error twice, and this third correction may induce the acceptance of the correct name

MUSCADIVORES.**XIV.—Some Notes in reply to Mr. G. M. Mathews.**

By W. R. OGILVIE-GRANT.

THE editor of 'The Ibis' having shown me the criticisms made by Mr. Mathews on certain points in the nomenclature used in my Report on the Birds collected in Dutch New Guinea, I feel bound to offer a few remarks in reply.